



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,840	10/31/2003	Timothy D. Gryseels	PC25024A	1267

28523 7590 08/27/2004
PFIZER INC.
PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611
EASTERN POINT ROAD
GROTON, CT 06340

EXAMINER
HAMA, JOANNE

ART UNIT 1632	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/698,840

Applicant(s)

GRYSEELS ET AL.

Examiner

Joanne Hama, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

This Application was filed October 31, 2003. Claims 1-20 are pending in this Restriction.

The Applicants claim priority to U.S. Provisional Application 60/422,834.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a method for the formation of embryoid bodies, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- II- V. Claims 6-16, 18, and 19, drawn to a method for differentiating embryonic stem cells, further comprising:
 - II. (claim 12, 18 and 19) contacting a differentiated cell produced by the culturing step with a therapeutic agent and the composition of cells produced via this method, classified in class 435, subclass 7.21.
 - III. (claim 13) using a cell produced by the culturing step in a cell replacement therapy, classified in class 435, subclass 7.21.
 - IV. (claim 14) using a cell produced by the culturing step to produce a tissue, classified in class 435, subclass 7.21.
 - V. (claims 15-16) determining the gene expression of the cells or embryoid bodies in the culture, classified in class 435, subclass 7.21.
- VI. Claims 17 and 20, drawn to a cellular composition of differentiated embryoid bodies, classified in class 435, subclass 7.21.

Art Unit: 1632

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Claims 6-11 link(s) inventions II-V. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 6-11. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Inventions II-V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, each of the Inventions, while depending on the same initial steps for embryonic stem cell differentiation, are different methods in which the cells will be used. The methods for use with a therapeutic agent, cell replacement therapy, production of tissue, and determining the gene

expression of a cell are materially different from each other. Furthermore, the methods of one of these Inventions do not depend on the other to function.

Inventions I and II-V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case Invention I is to a method for the formation of embryoid bodies. Inventions II-V are to methods in which the embryonic stem cells will be used. The methods used by Invention I are materially different from the methods used by Inventions II-V. Furthermore, the methods used by Invention I do not depend on Inventions II-V and vice versa.

Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case Invention I is to a method for the formation of embryoid bodies. Invention VI is to a cellular composition of differentiated embryoid bodies. The methods used by Invention I are materially different from the methods used by Invention VI. Furthermore, Invention I does not depend on Invention VI to function and vice versa.

Inventions II-V and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the

Art Unit: 1632

instant case, Inventions II-V are to methods in which the embryonic stem cells will be used. As shown by Inventions II-V, there are many ways that the composition of differentiated embryoid bodies, Invention VI, can be used.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter and the search required for one Invention is not required for the other, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Claim 11 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising differentiated cells. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship

Art Unit: 1632

must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Hama, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-2911. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amy Nelson, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0804. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/698,840

Page 7

Art Unit: 1632

JH

Joe Wontad
AUG 31